

Infinite dimensional finitely forcible graphon^{*}

Roman Glebov[†] Tereza Klimošová[‡] Daniel Král'[§]

Abstract

Graphons are analytic objects associated with convergent sequences of dense graphs. Problems from extremal combinatorics and theoretical computer science led to a study of finitely forcible graphons, i.e., graphons determined by finitely many subgraph densities. Lovász and Szegedy conjectured that the topological space of typical vertices of such a graphon always has finite dimension, which would also have implications on the number of parts in its weak ε -regular partition. We disprove the conjecture by constructing a finitely forcible graphon with the space of typical vertices with infinite dimension.

1 Introduction

Analytic objects associated with convergent sequences of combinatorial objects have recently attracted significant amount of attention. This line of research was initiated by the theory of limits of dense graphs [7–9, 27], followed by limits of sparse graphs [5, 12], permutations [18, 19], partial orders [21] and others. Analytic methods applied to such limit objects led to results in many areas of mathematics and computer science, in particular in extremal combinatorics [1–4, 13, 15–17, 22, 23, 32–36] and property testing [20, 30].

In this paper we are concerned with limits of dense graphs and the interplay of two properties of the corresponding limit object (graphon). One of them is

^{*}The work leading to this invention has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement no. 259385. A part of this work was done during a visit of the last two authors to the Institut Mittag-Leffler (Djursholm, Sweden).

[†]Department of Mathematics, ETH, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland. E-mail: roman.l.glebov@gmail.com. Previous affiliation: Mathematics Institute and DIMAP, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK.

[‡]Mathematics Institute and DIMAP, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK. E-mail: t.klimosova@warwick.ac.uk.

[§]Mathematics Institute, DIMAP and Department of Computer Science, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK. E-mail: d.kral@warwick.ac.uk.

whether a graphon is determined by finitely many subgraph densities, or equivalently, it is a unique solution of an extremal problem. This phenomenon, which is known as finite forcibility, is closely related to quasirandomness of combinatorial objects, as studied by Chung, Graham and Wilson [10], Rödl [37] and Thomason [38, 39]. In the setting of graphons, Lovász and Sós [25] proved a general result asserting that every step function, a multipartite graphon with uniform densities, is finitely forcible.

The other property we study is related to the structure of typical vertices of a graphon. Let $T(W)$ be the space of such vertices with the topology defined as in [26] and let $\overline{T}(W)$ be the same space with the topology given by the similarity distance [24, Chapter 13]. The topology of $T(W)$ is finer than that of $\overline{T}(W)$. For example, $\overline{T}(W)$ is always compact [24, Corollary 13.28] but $T(W)$ need not be compact even if W is finitely forcible [14]. The structure of the space $\overline{T}(W)$ is closely related to weak ε -regular partitions of W [24, 29]. In particular, if $\overline{T}(W)$ has finite Minkowski dimension, then the number of parts in a weak ε -regular partition of W can be bounded by a polynomial in ε^{-1} .

Lovász and Szegedy [26, Conjecture 10], led by examples of known finitely forcible graphons, proposed the following:

Conjecture 1. *If W is a finitely forcible graphon, then $T(W)$ is finite dimensional. (We intentionally do not specify which notion of dimension is meant here—a result concerning any variant would be interesting.)*

The Rademacher graphon W_R constructed in [14] is finitely forcible and the space $T(W_R)$ has infinite Minkowski dimension but its Lebesgue dimension is one and $\overline{T}(W_R)$ has both Minkowski and Lebesgue dimension one. This implies that the number of parts in a weak ε -regular partition of W_R is linear in ε^{-1} .

In this paper we construct a graphon $W_{\boxplus}$, which we call a hypercubical graphon, such that $W_{\boxplus}$ is finitely forcible and both $T(W_{\boxplus})$ and $\overline{T}(W_{\boxplus})$ contain subspaces homeomorphic to $[0, 1]^\infty$.

Theorem 1. *The hypercubical graphon $W_{\boxplus}$ is finitely forcible and the topological spaces $T(W_{\boxplus})$ and $\overline{T}(W_{\boxplus})$ contain subspaces homeomorphic to $[0, 1]^\infty$.*

Going back to one of the motivations for studying the dimension of the spaces $T(W)$ and $\overline{T}(W)$, we remark that a lower bound $2^{\Theta(\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})}$ on the number of parts in a weak ε -regular partition of $W_{\boxplus}$ can (easily) be proven. In particular, the number of parts in a weak ε -regular partition of a finitely forcible graphon needs not be polynomial in ε^{-1} .

The proof of Theorem 1 extends the methods from [14] and [31]. In particular, Norine [31] constructed finitely forcible graphons with the space of typical vertices of arbitrarily large (but finite) Lebesgue dimension. In his construction, both $T(W)$ and $\overline{T}(W)$ contain a subspace homeomorphic to $[0, 1]^d$.

2 Definitions

In this section we present the notation used throughout the paper. A *graph* is a pair (V, E) where $E \subseteq \binom{V}{2}$. The elements of V are called *vertices* and the elements of E are called *edges*. The *order* of a graph G is the number of its vertices and it is denoted by $|G|$. We use $\mathbb{N}^*$ for $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $[k]$ for $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

The *density* $d(H, G)$ of a graph H in a graph G is the probability that $|H|$ randomly chosen distinct vertices of G induce a subgraph isomorphic to H . If $|H| > |G|$, we set $d(H, G) = 0$. A sequence of graphs $(G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is *convergent* if the sequence $(d(H, G_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges for every graph H .

We now introduce basic notions from the theory of dense graph limits as developed in [7–9, 27]. A *graphon* W is a symmetric measurable function from $[0, 1]^2$ to $[0, 1]$. Here, symmetric stands for the property that $W(x, y) = W(y, x)$ for every $x, y \in [0, 1]$.

A *W-random graph* of order k is obtained by sampling k random vertices $x_1, \dots, x_k \in [0, 1]$ uniformly and independently and joining the i -th and the j -th vertex by an edge with probability $W(x_i, x_j)$. Since the points of $[0, 1]$ play the role of vertices, we refer to them as to vertices of W .

Observe that W plays the role of the appropriately scaled adjacency matrix. Clearly, the following holds:

$$d(H, W) = \frac{|H|!}{|\text{Aut}(H)|} \int_{[0,1]^{|H|}} \prod_{(i,j) \in E(H)} W(x_i, x_j) \prod_{(i,j) \notin E(H)} (1 - W(x_i, x_j)) \, d\lambda_{|H|},$$

where $\text{Aut}(H)$ is the automorphism group of H .

Mimicking the terminology for graphs, we call a graphon W restricted to $S \times T$ for $S, T \in [0, 1]$, a *subgraphon* on $S \times T$ and we denote it by $W[S \times T]$. The *density* between S and T (or on $S \times T$) of a graphon W , is

$$\frac{\int_S \int_T W(x, y) dx dy}{\lambda(S)\lambda(T)}.$$

We say that $W[S \times S]$ for $S \subseteq [0, 1]$ is a *clique* in a graphon W , if W equals 1 almost everywhere on $S \times S$. A subgraphon $W[S \times T]$ of W is a *complete bipartite subgraphon with sides S and T* for some $S, T \subseteq [0, 1]$, $S \cap T = \emptyset$ if W equals 1 almost everywhere on $S \times T$. Similarly $W[S \times T]$ is a *pseudorandom bipartite subgraphon of density p* for $p \in [0, 1]$ if W equals p almost everywhere on $S \times T$.

One of the key results in the theory of dense graph limits asserts that for every convergent sequence $(G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of graphs with increasing orders, there exists a graphon W (called the *limit* of the sequence) such that for every graph H ,

$$d(H, W) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} d(H, G_i).$$

Conversely, if W is a graphon, then the sequence of W -random graphs with increasing orders converges with probability one and its limit is W .

Two graphons W_1 and W_2 are *weakly isomorphic* if $d(H, W_1) = d(H, W_2)$ for every graph H . If $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a measure preserving map, then the graphon $W^\varphi(x, y) := W(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))$ is always weakly isomorphic to W . The opposite is true in the following sense [6]: if two graphons W_1 and W_2 are weakly isomorphic, then there exist measure preserving maps $\varphi_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $\varphi_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $W_1^{\varphi_1} = W_2^{\varphi_2}$ almost everywhere.

Every graphon can be assigned a topological space associated with its typical vertices [28]. For a graphon W , define for every $x \in [0, 1]$ a function

$$f_x^W(y) := W(x, y).$$

Since almost every function f_x^W belongs to $L^1([0, 1])$, the graphon W naturally defines a probability measure μ on $L^1([0, 1])$. Let $T(W)$ be the set formed by the functions $f \in L^1([0, 1])$ such that every neighborhood of f in $L^1([0, 1])$ has positive measure with respect to μ . The set $T(W)$ inherits topology from $L^1([0, 1])$ and it is called the *space of typical vertices* of W . The vertices x of W with $f_x^W \in T(W)$ are called *typical vertices* of a graphon W . A coarser topology on $T(W)$ can be defined using the similarity distance between $f, g \in L^1([0, 1])$ defined as

$$d_W(f, g) := \int_{[0, 1]} \left| \int_{[0, 1]} W(x, y)(f(y) - g(y)) dy \right| dx .$$

The space with this topology is denoted by $\overline{T}(W)$. The topological space $\overline{T}(W)$ is always compact [24, Chapter 13] and its structure is related to weak regular partitions of W [29] as we have also mentioned earlier.

2.1 Finite forcibility

A graphon W is *finitely forcible* if there exist graphs $H_1, \dots, H_k$ such that every graphon W' satisfying $d(H_i, W) = d(H_i, W')$ for every $i \in [k]$ is weakly isomorphic to W . For example, the result of Diaconis, Holmes, and Janson [11] is equivalent to the statement that the half-graphon $W_\Delta(x, y)$ defined as $W_\Delta(x, y) = 1$ if $x + y \geq 1$, and $W_\Delta = 0$, otherwise, is finitely forcible. Also see [26] for further results in this direction.

Following the framework from [14], when proving the finite forcibility of a graphon, we give a set of *constraints* that uniquely determines W instead of specifying the finitely many subgraphs and their densities that uniquely determine W . A *constraint* is an equality between two density expressions where a *density expression* is recursively defined as follows: a real number or a graph H are density expressions, and if D_1 and D_2 are two density expressions, then the sum $D_1 + D_2$ and the product $D_1 \cdot D_2$ are also density expressions. The value of the density expression is the value obtained by substituting for every subgraph H its density in the graphon. As observed in [14], if W is a unique (up to weak

isomorphism) graphon that satisfies a finite set $\mathcal{C}$ of constraints, then it is finitely forcible. In particular, W is the unique (up to weak isomorphism) graphon with densities of subgraphs appearing in $\mathcal{C}$ equal to their densities in W .

In [14], it was also observed that a more general form of constraints, called *rooted constraints*, can be used in finite forcibility. A subgraph is rooted if it has m distinguished vertices labeled with numbers $1, \dots, m$. These vertices are referred to as roots while the other vertices are non-roots. Two rooted graphs are *compatible* if the subgraphs induced by their roots are isomorphic through an isomorphism mapping the roots with the same label to each other. Similarly, two rooted graphs are isomorphic if there exists an isomorphism mapping the i -th root of one of them to the i -th root of the other.

A *rooted density* expression is a density expression such that all graphs that appear in it are mutually compatible rooted graphs. The meaning of a rooted density expression is defined in the next paragraphs.

Fix a rooted graph H . Let H_0 be the graph induced by the roots of H , and let $m = |H_0|$. For a graphon W with $d(H_0, W) > 0$, we let the auxiliary function $c : [0, 1]^m \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote the probability that an m -tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in [0, 1]^m$ induces a copy of H_0 in W respecting the labeling of vertices of H_0 :

$$c(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \left(\prod_{(i,j) \in E(H_0)} W(x_i, x_j) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{(i,j) \notin E(H_0)} (1 - W(x_i, x_j)) \right).$$

We next define a probability measure μ on $[0, 1]^m$. If $A \subseteq [0, 1]^m$ is a Borel set, then:

$$\mu(A) = \frac{\int_A c(x_1, \dots, x_m) d\lambda_m}{\int_{[0,1]^m} c(x_1, \dots, x_m) d\lambda_m}.$$

When $x_1, \dots, x_m \in [0, 1]$ are fixed, then the density of a graph H with root vertices $x_1, \dots, x_m$ is the probability that a random sample of non-roots yields a copy of H conditioned on the roots inducing H_0 . Noticing that an automorphism of a rooted graph has all roots as fixed vertices, we obtain that this is equal to

$$\frac{(|H| - m)!}{|\text{Aut}(H)|} \int_{[0,1]^{|H|-m}} \prod_{(i,j) \in E(H_0) \setminus E(H)} W(x_i, x_j) \prod_{(i,j) \notin E(H) \cup \binom{H_0}{2}} (1 - W(x_i, x_j)) d\lambda_{|H|-m}.$$

We now consider a constraint such that both left and right hand sides D and D' are compatible rooted density expressions. Such a constraint represents that $D - D' = 0$ holds with probability one with respect to the choice of roots. At several occasions, we write a fraction of two rooted density expressions D/D' . A constraint containing such a fraction, say $D_1/D'_1 = D_2/D'_2$ should be interpreted as $D_1 \cdot D'_2 = D_2 \cdot D'_1$. It can be shown that for every rooted constraint $D = D'$,

there exists a non-rooted constraint $C = C'$ such that $D = D'$ with probability one if and only if $C = C'$ holds [14].

A *degree* $\deg^W x$ of a vertex $x \in [0, 1]$ in a graphon W is equal to

$$\int_{[0,1]} W(x, y) dy .$$

Note that the degree is well-defined for almost every vertex of W . We omit the superscript W whenever the graphon is clear from the context.

Let A be a measurable non-null subset of $[0, 1]$. A *relative degree* $\deg_A^W x$ of a vertex $x \in [0, 1]$ of a graphon W in A is equal to

$$\frac{\int_A W(x, y) dy}{\lambda(A)} .$$

Fix a graphon W and let $x, x' \in [0, 1]$ and $Y \subseteq [0, 1]$. Then $N_Y(x)$ denotes the set of $y \in Y$ such that $W(x, y) > 0$ and

$$N_Y(x \setminus x') = \{y \in Y \mid W(x, y) > 0 \text{ and } W(x', y) < 1\}.$$

If Y is measurable, then $N_Y(x)$ is measurable for almost every x .

A graphon W is *partitioned* if there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, positive reals $a_1, \dots, a_k$ summing to one and distinct reals $d_1, \dots, d_k$ between 0 and 1 such that the set of vertices of W with degree d_i has measure a_i . If W is a partitioned graphon, we write A_i for the set of vertices of degree d_i for $i \in [k]$.

A graph H is *decorated* if its vertices are labeled with parts $A_1, \dots, A_k$. The density of a decorated graph H is the probability that randomly chosen $|H|$ vertices induce a subgraph isomorphic to H with its vertices contained in the parts corresponding to the labels, conditioned by the event that the sampled vertices are in the parts corresponding to the labels. For example, if H is an edge with vertices labeled with parts A_1 and A_2 , then the density of H is the density of edges between A_1 and A_2 , i.e.,

$$d(H, W) = \frac{1}{a_1 a_2} \int_{A_1} \int_{A_2} W(x, y) dx dy .$$

Similarly as in the case of non-decorated graphs, we can define rooted decorated subgraphs and use them in constraints. A constraint that uses (rooted or non-rooted) decorated subgraphs is referred to as decorated. In [14], it is shown that decorated constraints can be used in forcing (also see Lemma 3 below).

We depict roots of decorated graphs by squares, and non-root vertices by circles, labeled by the name of the respective part of a graphon. The full lines connecting vertices correspond edges, dashed lines to non-edges. No connection between two vertices means that both edge or non-edge are allowed between the

vertices, i.e., the corresponding density is the sum of the densities of the graphs with and without such edge(s).

To avoid possible ambiguity, all the graphs in each constraint have the same set of roots and the same connections between the roots. A drawing of the graph on the roots is identical for all occurrences of the graph in a constraint to make clear which roots correspond to each other.

We conclude this section by lemmas from [14], used in our proof.

The first lemma guarantees the existence of a set of constraints that force a graphon satisfying these constraints to be a partitioned graphon with a given partition and given degrees between the parts.

Lemma 2. *Let $a_1, \dots, a_k$ be positive real numbers summing to one and let $d_1, \dots, d_k$ be distinct reals between 0 and 1. There exists a finite set of constraints $\mathcal{C}$ such that any graphon W satisfying $\mathcal{C}$ must be a partitioned graphon with parts of sizes $a_1, \dots, a_k$ and degrees $d_1, \dots, d_k$.*

The following lemma allows us to use decorated constraints by stating that they are equivalent to some non-decorated constraints.

Lemma 3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $a_1, \dots, a_k$ be positive real numbers summing to one and let $d_1, \dots, d_k$ be distinct reals between zero and one. If W is a partitioned graphon with k parts formed by vertices of degree d_i and measure a_i each, then any decorated (rooted or non-rooted) constraint can be expressed as a non-decorated non-rooted constraint, i.e., W satisfies the decorated constraint if and only if it satisfies the non-decorated non-rooted constraint.*

Note that our definition of density of a decorated graph H differs from the definition in [14]. However, density of a decorated graph H in our sense is density of a decorated graph H in the sense of [14] multiplied by the appropriate constant depending on measures of the parts of the graphon. Therefore, decorated constraints in our sense and in the sense of [14] are in one-to-one correspondence. Thus, Lemma 3 holds with our definition of decorated constraints, too.

The last lemma states that we can always force a pseudorandom bipartite graphon between two parts of a partitioned graphon.

Lemma 4. *For every choice of $k \in \mathbb{N}$, positive reals $a_1, \dots, a_k$ summing to one, distinct reals $d_1, \dots, d_k$ between zero and one $l, l' \leq k$, $l \neq l'$, and $p \in [0, 1]$, there exists a finite set of constraints $\mathcal{C}$ such that every graphon W that is a partitioned graphon with k parts $A_1, \dots, A_k$ of measures $a_1, \dots, a_k$ and degrees $d_1, \dots, d_k$, respectively, and that satisfies $\mathcal{C}$ also satisfies that $W(x, y) = p$ for almost every $x \in A_l$ and $y \in A_{l'}$.*

3 The hypercubical graphon

In this section, we describe a graphon $W_{\boxplus}$ which we call the *hypercubical graphon*. For readability, we include a sketch of the structure of $W_{\boxplus}$ in Figure 1.




Figure 1: The hypercubical graphon.

The *hypercubical graphon* $W_{\boxplus}$ is a partitioned graphon with 14 parts, denoted by $A_0^{\boxplus}, \dots, A_3^{\boxplus}, B_1^{\boxplus}, \dots, B_5^{\boxplus}, C^{\boxplus}, D^{\boxplus}, E_1^{\boxplus}, E_2^{\boxplus}, F^{\boxplus}$. Each part has measure $1/27$ except for $E_1^{\boxplus}$ and $E_2^{\boxplus}$ that have measure $11/27$ and $4/27$, respectively. Degrees of the vertices in different parts are listed in Table 1. We do not provide the exact values e_1 and e_2 of degrees of vertices in $E_1^{\boxplus}$ and $E_2^{\boxplus}$, respectively. Instead, we observe that $e_1 \leq 10/27$ and $e_2 \leq 1/27$ (since the neighborhood of every vertex of $E_1^{\boxplus}$ or $E_2^{\boxplus}$ has neighborhood if measure at most $10/27$ or $1/27$, respectively), therefore, e_1, e_2 are different from degrees of vertices in parts $A_0^{\boxplus}, \dots, A_3^{\boxplus}, B_1^{\boxplus}, \dots, B_5^{\boxplus}, C^{\boxplus}$ and e_2 is also different from $D^{\boxplus}$ and $F^{\boxplus}$. Moreover, from the construction of $W_{\boxplus}$, it follows that $e_1 > 5/27$ and therefore it is different from e_2 and from degrees of vertices in $D^{\boxplus}$ and $F^{\boxplus}$.

We describe the graphon $W_{\boxplus}$ as a collection of functions $W_{\boxplus}^{X \times Y}$ on products

part	$A_0^\boxplus$	$A_1^\boxplus$	$A_2^\boxplus$	$A_3^\boxplus$	$B_1^\boxplus$	$B_2^\boxplus$	$B_3^\boxplus$	$B_4^\boxplus$	$B_5^\boxplus$
degree	$\frac{110}{270}$	$\frac{111}{270}$	$\frac{112}{270}$	$\frac{113}{270}$	$\frac{114}{270}$	$\frac{115}{270}$	$\frac{116}{270}$	$\frac{117}{270}$	$\frac{118}{270}$

part	$C^\boxplus$	$D^\boxplus$	$E_1^\boxplus$	$E_2^\boxplus$	$F^\boxplus$
degree	$\frac{119}{270}$	$\frac{40}{270}$	e_1	e_2	$\frac{45}{270}$

Table 1: Degrees of the parts of $W_\boxplus$.

of its parts X, Y . For better readability, we define these as functions from $[0, 1]^2$ to $[0, 1]$, assuming that we have a fixed bijective (scaling) map η_X from each part $X^\boxplus$ to $[0, 1]$ such that $\lambda(\eta_X^{-1}(S)) = \lambda(S)\lambda(X^\boxplus)$ for every measurable set $S \subseteq [0, 1]$. So, $W_\boxplus(x, y) = W_\boxplus^{X \times Y}(\eta_X(x), \eta_Y(y))$ for $x \in X^\boxplus$ and $y \in Y^\boxplus$. Note that, unlike graphons, the functions $W_\boxplus^{X \times Y}$ need not to be symmetric, instead they satisfy $W_\boxplus^{X \times Y}(x, y) = W_\boxplus^{Y \times X}(y, x)$.

For $x \in [1 - 2^{-k}, 1 - 2^{-(k+1)})$, let $\hat{x} = (x - (1 - 2^{-k})) \cdot 2^{k+1}$ (the relative position of x within the interval) and $\langle x \rangle = k + 1$. Informally speaking, if we imagine $[0, 1]$ as partitioned into consecutive intervals of measures $1/2, 1/4$, etc., $\langle x \rangle$ indicates to which of the intervals x belongs. Observe that $x = 1 - 2^{1-\langle x \rangle} + \hat{x}/2^{\langle x \rangle}$ for every $x \in [0, 1]$.

The *diagonal checker* function $\varkappa : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is defined as follows (see Figure 2):

$$\varkappa(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle = \langle y \rangle \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $x \in [0, 1]^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we denote its i -th coordinate of x by $(x)_i$. A *recipe* $\mathfrak{R}$ is a set of measure preserving maps r_n for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $r_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$.




Figure 2: The diagonal checker function $\varkappa$.

Observe that $\mathfrak{R} = \{r_n | n \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$ is a recipe if and only if

$$\lambda(\{x | \forall i \in [k] (r_n(x))_i \leq a_i\}) = \prod_{i=1}^k a_i \text{ for every } (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in [0, 1]^k \quad (1)$$

for every $k \in [n]$ (here, we abuse the notation by setting $[\infty] = \mathbb{N}$). A recipe is *bijective* if all the functions are bijective.

For a fixed bijective recipe $\mathfrak{R}$, the graphon $W_{\boxplus}$ is defined as follows:

$$W_{\boxplus}^{A_0^{\boxplus} \times A_1^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } (x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1/2], \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times A_1^{\boxplus}} = W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times A_2^{\boxplus}} = W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times B_1^{\boxplus}} = W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times B_2^{\boxplus}} = W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times B_3^{\boxplus}} = W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times B_4^{\boxplus}} = W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times B_5^{\boxplus}} \\ = W_{\boxplus}^{A_2^{\boxplus} \times A_3^{\boxplus}} = W_{\boxplus}^{A_2^{\boxplus} \times B_2^{\boxplus}} = \varkappa.$$

For $X \in A_0^{\boxplus}, \dots, A_3^{\boxplus}, B_2^{\boxplus}, \dots, B_5^{\boxplus}, C^{\boxplus}$, let:

$$W_{\boxplus}^{C^{\boxplus} \times X}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x + y \geq 1, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that for $x \in [1 - 2^{-k}, 1 - 2^{-(k+1)})$, $\widehat{x} = (x - (1 - 2^{-k})) \cdot 2^{k+1}$ and $\langle x \rangle = k + 1$.

$$W_{\boxplus}^{A_1^{\boxplus} \times A_3^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle = \langle y \rangle + 1, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{C^{\boxplus} \times B_1^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } (1 - 2^{1-\langle y \rangle}) + (r_{\langle y \rangle}(\widehat{y}))_1 \cdot 2^{-\langle y \rangle} + x \geq 1, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{B_1^{\boxplus} \times B_1^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle \leq \langle y \rangle \text{ and } (r_{\langle x \rangle}(\widehat{x}))_i \leq (r_{\langle y \rangle}(\widehat{y}))_i \text{ for every } i \leq \langle x \rangle, \\ 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle > \langle y \rangle \text{ and } (r_{\langle x \rangle}(\widehat{x}))_i \geq (r_{\langle y \rangle}(\widehat{y}))_i \text{ for every } i \leq \langle y \rangle, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{B_1^{\boxplus} \times B_2^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle \geq \langle y \rangle \text{ and } \widehat{y} \leq (r_{\langle x \rangle}(\widehat{x}))_{\langle y \rangle}, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{B_1^{\boxplus} \times B_3^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle \geq \langle y \rangle, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{B_1^{\boxplus} \times B_4^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle \geq \langle y \rangle \text{ and } \widehat{y} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{\langle y \rangle} (r_{\langle x \rangle}(\widehat{x}))_i, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{B_1^{\boxplus} \times B_5^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \langle x \rangle \geq \langle y \rangle \text{ and } \widehat{y} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{\langle y \rangle} (1 - (r_{\langle x \rangle}(\widehat{x}))_i), \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{D^{\boxplus} \times B_1^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \widehat{y} \leq (r_{\infty}(x))_i \text{ for every } i \leq \langle y \rangle, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{D^{\boxplus} \times B_2^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \widehat{y} \leq (r_{\infty}(x))_{\langle y \rangle}, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{D^{\boxplus} \times B_4^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \widehat{y} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{\langle y \rangle} (r_{\infty}(x))_i, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{D^{\boxplus} \times B_5^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \widehat{y} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{\langle y \rangle} (1 - (r_{\infty}(x))_i), \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For every $X \in A_0^{\boxplus}, \dots, A_3^{\boxplus}, B_1^{\boxplus}, \dots, B_5^{\boxplus}, C^{\boxplus}$:

$$W_{\boxplus}^{E_1^{\boxplus} \times X}(x, y) = 1 - 1/11 \sum_{Y \in A_0^{\boxplus}, \dots, A_3^{\boxplus}, B_1^{\boxplus}, \dots, B_5^{\boxplus}, C^{\boxplus}, D^{\boxplus}} \deg_Y y.$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{E_2^{\boxplus} \times D}(x, y) = 1 - 1/4 \sum_{Y \in B_1^{\boxplus}, B_2^{\boxplus}, B_4^{\boxplus}, B_5^{\boxplus}} \deg_Y y.$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times A_1^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 1/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times A_2^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 2/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times A_3^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 3/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times B_1^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 4/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times B_2^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 5/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times B_3^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 6/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times B_4^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 7/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2,$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times B_5^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 8/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2, \text{ and}$$

$$W_{\boxplus}^{F^{\boxplus} \times C^{\boxplus}}(x, y) = 9/10 \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [0, 1]^2.$$

$W_{\boxplus}$ is identically equal to 0 on all the pairs of parts that are not listed above and that are not symmetric to the pairs listed.

Note that the definition of $W_{\boxplus}$ is dependent on the choice of a bijective recipe $\mathfrak{R}$. However, it can be shown that the graphons obtained for different bijective recipes are weakly isomorphic. (In fact, the statement stays true even if $\mathfrak{R}$ is a recipe that is not bijective.) Therefore we do not include the dependence on the recipe in the notation for the hypercubical graphon.

Before proceeding further, let us introduce additional notation that makes use of the structure of the diagonal checker subgraphons. We denote the set of vertices x of A_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$, with $\deg_{A_1^{\boxplus}} x = 2^{-k}$ in $A_1^{\boxplus}$ by $A_{i,k}$ and we call $A_{i,k}$ the k -th level of A_i . We define levels $B_{j,k}$ of B_j for $j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ in the same way.

Similarly, we denote $A_{3,k}^{\boxplus}$ the set of vertices of $A_3^{\boxplus}$ of relative degree 2^{-k} in $A_2^{\boxplus}$ and we call the set of these vertices the k -th level of $A_3^{\boxplus}$. Note that measure of the k -th level is $2^{-k}/27$ for every k and every A_i , $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and B_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$.

The following proposition and theorem imply the Theorem 1.

Proposition 1. *Both $T(W_{\boxplus})$ and $\overline{T}(W_{\boxplus})$ contain a subspace homeomorphic to $[0, 1]^{\infty}$.*

Proof. Every vertex of the part $D^{\boxplus}$ of the graphon $W_{\boxplus}$ is typical. In addition, the restrictions of the spaces $T(W_{\boxplus})$ and $\overline{T}(W_{\boxplus})$ to $\{f_x^{W_{\boxplus}}(y) := W_{\boxplus}(x, y), x \in D^{\boxplus}\}$ are the same. Recall that $\lambda(B_{j,i}^{\boxplus}) = 2^{-i}/27$ for $j \in \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$,

$$\deg_{B_{1,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x = \deg_{B_{4,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x = \prod_{k \in [i]} \deg_{B_{2,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x \text{ and}$$

$$\deg_{B_{5,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x = \prod_{k \in [i]} (1 - \deg_{B_{2,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x)$$

for every $x \in D^{\boxplus}$. Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(E_2^{\boxplus}) \left| \deg_{E_2^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x - \deg_{E_2^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x' \right| &= \left| \sum_{j \in \{1, 2, 4, 5\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{j,i}^{\boxplus}) \deg_{B_{j,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x - \deg_{B_{j,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x' \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in \{1, 2, 4, 5\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{j,i}^{\boxplus}) \left| \deg_{B_{j,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x - \deg_{B_{j,i}^{\boxplus}}^{W_{\boxplus}} x' \right|. \end{aligned}$$

This leads us to the following estimates for all $x, x' \in D^{\boxplus}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_x^{W_\boxplus} - f_{x'}^{W_\boxplus}\|_1 &\leq 2 \left(\sum_{j \in \{1,2,4,5\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{j,i}^\boxplus) \left| \deg_{B_{j,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{j,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \right) \\
&= 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{2,i}^\boxplus) \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{1,i}^\boxplus) \left| \prod_{k=1}^i \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \prod_{k=1}^i \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{4,i}^\boxplus) \left| \prod_{k=1}^i \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \prod_{k=1}^i \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{5,i}^\boxplus) \left| \prod_{k=1}^i (1 - \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x) - \prod_{k=1}^i (1 - \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x') \right| \right) \\
&= \frac{2}{27} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \right. \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \left| \prod_{k=1}^i \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \prod_{k=1}^i \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \left| \prod_{k=1}^i (1 - \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x) - \prod_{k=1}^i (1 - \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x') \right| \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2}{27} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \left| \deg_{B_{j,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{j,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \right. \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \sum_{k=1}^i \left| \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \sum_{k=1}^i \left| (1 - \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x) - (1 - \deg_{B_{2,k}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x') \right| \right) \\
&= \frac{14}{27} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_x^{W_\boxplus} - f_{x'}^{W_\boxplus}\|_1 &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{2,i}^\boxplus) \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{27} \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
d_W(f_x^{W_\boxplus}, f_{x'}^{W_\boxplus}) &\leq \|f_x^{W_\boxplus} - f_{x'}^{W_\boxplus}\|_1 = \frac{14}{27} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-i} \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \\
d_W(f_x^{W_\boxplus}, f_{x'}^{W_\boxplus}) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{A_{2,i}^\boxplus} \left| \int_{[0,1]} W_\boxplus(z, y) (f_x^{W_\boxplus}(y) - f_{x'}^{W_\boxplus}(y)) dy \right| dz \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{A_{2,i}^\boxplus} \lambda(B_{2,i}^\boxplus) \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| dz \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(A_{2,i}^\boxplus) \lambda(B_{2,i}^\boxplus) \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{27} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 4^{-i} \left| \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x - \deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x' \right|
\end{aligned}$$

Since the map H from the restriction of $T(W)$ to $\{f_x^{W_\boxplus}, x \in D^\boxplus\}$ to $[0, 1]^\infty$ defined as

$$H(f_x^{W_\boxplus}) = (\deg_{B_{2,i}^\boxplus}^{W_\boxplus} x)_{i=1}^\infty$$

is a homeomorphism by the definition of $W_\boxplus$ and $\mathfrak{R}$, the statement of the proposition follows. $\square$

Theorem 5. *The hypercubical graphon $W_\boxplus$ is finitely forcible.*

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5.

4 Constraints

In this section, we present the constraints that finitely force the graphon $W_\boxplus$, as we prove in the next section. The set of these constraints is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_\boxplus$.

The constraints in $\mathcal{C}_\boxplus$ are split into groups according to what features of a graphon they force:

Partition constraints force that every graphon satisfying $\mathcal{C}_\boxplus$ can be partitioned into parts of the sizes as and degrees of vertices as in $W_\boxplus$. The existence of such constraints follows from Lemma 2.

In the rest of the section, we assume that W is a partitioned graphon and we will refer to the parts of W as $A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5, C, D, E_1, E_2, F$, respectively.

Zero constraints force that W equals 0 almost everywhere on

- $A_0 \times (A_0 \cup A_2 \cup A_3 \cup B_1 \cup B_3 \cup B_4 \cup B_5 \cup D \cup E_2 \cup F)$,




Figure 3: Constraint forcing zero edge density.

part	A_0	A_1	A_2	A_3	B_1	B_2	B_3	B_4	B_5	C
density	0	$\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{2}{10}$	$\frac{3}{10}$	$\frac{4}{10}$	$\frac{5}{10}$	$\frac{6}{10}$	$\frac{7}{10}$	$\frac{8}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$

Table 2: Densities between the part F and the other parts.

- $A_1 \times (D \cup E_2)$,
- $A_2 \times (A_2 \cup B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_5 \cup D \cup E_2)$,
- $A_3 \times (A_3 \cup B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_5 \cup D \cup E_2)$,
- $B_2 \times (B_2 \cup \dots \cup B_5 \cup E_2)$,
- $B_3 \times (B_3 \cup B_4 \cup B_5 \cup D \cup E_2)$,
- $B_4 \times (B_4 \cup B_5 \cup E_2)$,
- $B_5 \times (B_5 \cup E_2)$,
- $C \times (D \cup E_2)$,
- $D \times (D \cup E_1)$,
- $E_1 \times (E_1 \cup E_2 \cup F)$,
- $E_2 \times (E_2 \cup F)$, and
- $F \times F$.

The constraint forcing the zero edge density between parts X and Y is depicted in Figure 3.

Degree unifying constraints force that the relative degree $\deg_{[0,1] \setminus (E_2 \cup F)} x$ of almost every vertex $x \in [0, 1] \setminus (D \cup E_1 \cup E_2 \cup F)$ is $1/2$ and that the degree $\deg y$ of almost every vertex $y \in D$ is $4/27$. These constraints are depicted in Figures 4 and 5.

Degree distinguishing constraints force that the structure between F and the remaining parts of a graphon consists of pseudorandom bipartite subgraphons of densities given in Table 2.

By Lemma 4, this can be forced by finitely many constraints. An example of the constraints for $F \times C$ is depicted in Figure 6.

$$\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{E_1} \\ | \\ \boxed{X} \end{array} = 1 - \frac{1}{11} \sum_{\substack{Z \in \{A_0, \dots, A_3, \\ B_1, \dots, B_5, C, D\}}} \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{Z} \\ | \\ \boxed{X} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{E_1} \\ / \quad \backslash \\ \boxed{X} \quad \boxed{Y} \end{array} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{11} \sum_{\substack{Z \in \{A_0, \dots, A_3, \\ B_1, \dots, B_5, C, D\}}} \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{Z} \\ / \quad \backslash \\ \boxed{X} \quad \boxed{Y} \end{array} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{11} \sum_{\substack{Z \in \{A_0, \dots, A_3, \\ B_1, \dots, B_5, C, D\}}} \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{Z} \\ / \quad \backslash \\ \boxed{X} \quad \boxed{Y} \end{array} \right)$$

Figure 4: The degree unifying constraints contain the depicted constraints for all the choices of X and Y in $\{A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5, C\}$.

$$\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{E_2} \\ | \\ \boxed{D} \end{array} = 1 - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{Z \in \{B_1, B_2, B_4, B_5\}} \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{Z} \\ | \\ \boxed{D} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{E_2} \\ / \quad \backslash \\ \boxed{D} \quad \boxed{D} \end{array} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{Z \in \{B_1, B_2, B_4, B_5\}} \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{Z} \\ / \quad \backslash \\ \boxed{D} \quad \boxed{D} \end{array} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{Z \in \{B_1, B_2, B_4, B_5\}} \begin{array}{c} \textcircled{Z} \\ / \quad \backslash \\ \boxed{D} \quad \boxed{D} \end{array} \right)$$

Figure 5: The degree unifying constraints for D .

$$\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{C} \\ | \\ \boxed{F} \end{array} = \frac{9}{10} \quad \begin{array}{c} \boxed{F} \quad \textcircled{C} \\ \quad \quad \quad \backslash \\ \boxed{F} \quad \textcircled{C} \end{array} = \frac{81}{100}$$

Figure 6: The degree distinguishing constraints for $F \times C$.




Figure 7: The triangular constraints include the depicted constraints for all the choices of X in $\{A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5\}$.




Figure 8: The main diagonal checker constraints.

Triangular constraints force the structure on $C \times X$ is as in $W_{\boxplus}$ for every $X \in A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5, C$. From the proof of the Theorem 5.1 in [26] it follows that there exist finitely many constraints forcing the triangular structure on $C \times C$. The triangular constraints forcing the structure elsewhere are depicted in Figure 7. They ensure that the triangular structure of $C \times C$ is replicated to other parts of the graphon.

Main diagonal checker constraints force the diagonal checker structure of $A_1 \times A_1$. They are depicted in Figure 8.

Complete bipartition constraints force, in particular, that the subgraphons on $A_1 \times A_2, A_1 \times A_3, A_1 \times B_1, \dots, A_1 \times B_5, A_2 \times A_3$ and $A_2 \times B_2$ are unions of complete bipartite subgraphons. The constraints are given in Figure 9.

Auxiliary diagonal checker constraints determine the sizes of the sides of complete bipartite subgraphons in $A_1 \times A_2, A_1 \times A_3, A_1 \times B_1, \dots, A_1 \times B_5, A_2 \times A_3$ and $A_2 \times B_2$. They are depicted in Figure 10.

First level constraints force the structure of $A_0 \times A_1$ and they are depicted in Figure 11.

Stair constraints force the structure of $B_1 \times B_3$ and $B_2 \times B_3$. They are depicted in Figure 12.

Coordinate constraints force some features of structure of $B_1 \times (B_2 \cup B_4 \cup B_5)$ and $D \times (B_2 \cup B_4 \cup B_5)$. They can be found in Figure 13.

Distribution constraints determining the relative degrees of vertices of B_2 in B_1 and D are depicted in Figure 14.




Figure 9: The complete bipartition constraints consist of the first two constraint for $(X, Y) \in \{(A_1, A_2), (A_1, A_3), (A_1, B_1), \dots, (A_1, B_5), (A_2, A_3), (A_2, B_2)\}$ and the second two constraints for $(X, Y) \in \{(A_1, A_2), (A_1, A_3), (A_1, B_2), \dots, (A_1, B_5), (A_2, A_3), (A_2, B_2)\}$.




Figure 10: The auxiliary diagonal checker constraints consist of the depicted constraints, where Y in the first constraints attains all values in $\{A_2, B_1, \dots, B_5\}$ and Z in the second constraint attains all values in $\{A_3, B_2\}$.




Figure 11: The first level constraints.




Figure 12: The stair constraints.




Figure 13: The coordinate constraints consist of the depicted constraints, where X and Y attain all values in $\{B_2, B_4, B_5\}$, $\{B_1, D\}$ respectively.




Figure 14: The distribution constraints.




Figure 15: The initial coordinate constraint.




Figure 16: The product constraints forcing $B_1 \times B_4$ and $D \times B_4$ consist of the depicted constraints, where $X \in \{B_1, D\}$.

An *initial coordinate constraint* determine the relative degrees of vertices of B_1 in a subset of B_2 . It is depicted in Figure 15.

Product constraints force the structure of $B_1 \times B_4$, $D \times B_4$, $B_1 \times B_5$ and $D \times B_5$. They are depicted in Figures 16, 17.

Projection constraints force the structure of $B_1 \times B_1$. They are depicted in Figures 18 and 19.

The *infinite constraints* force the structure between D and the parts B_1 and B_2 of the graphon. They are depicted in Figure 20.

This completes the list of the constraints in $\mathcal{C}_{\boxplus}$




Figure 17: The product constraints forcing $B_1 \times B_5$ and $D \times B_5$ consist of the depicted constraints, where $X \in \{B_1, D\}$.

5 Proof of Theorem 5

Let W be a graphon satisfying all constraints of $\mathcal{C}_{\boxplus}$. Since W satisfies the partition constraints, the interval $[0, 1]$ can be partitioned into parts of the sizes as in $W_{\boxplus}$ such that the degrees of vertices in these parts are as in $W_{\boxplus}$. In particular, there exists a measure preserving map $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that the subsets of $[0, 1]$ corresponding to the parts of $W_{\boxplus}$ map to the corresponding parts of W . From now on, we denote the parts of W^{φ} corresponding to the respective parts of $W_{\boxplus}$ by $A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5, C, D, E_1, E_2, F$. Note that by the definition of φ , the corresponding parts in $W_{\boxplus}$ and in W^{φ} represent the same subsets of $[0, 1]$, for instance $A_0 = A_0^{\boxplus}$. We write $A_0, \dots, F$ in the context of the graphon W^{φ} and $A_0^{\boxplus}, \dots, F^{\boxplus}$ in the context of the graphon $W_{\boxplus}$.

By Monotone Reordering Theorem (see [24] for more details), there exist measure preserving maps $\psi_X : X \rightarrow X^{\boxplus}$ for $X = A_0, \dots, A_3, B_2, \dots, B_5, C, E_1, E_2, F$ and non-decreasing functions $f_X : X^{\boxplus} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, such that $f_X(\psi_X(x)) = \deg_C^{W^{\varphi}} x$ for every $x \in X$.

In the analogy to $B_{1,n}^{\boxplus}$ and $B_{2,n}^{\boxplus}$, we define $B_{1,n}$ and $B_{2,n}$ to be the vertices of B_1 and B_2 , respectively, that have relative degree $1/2^n$ in A_1 in W^{φ} . Let $\mathfrak{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots\}$ be the bijective recipe used to define $W_{\boxplus}$.

Let $\eta_{B_{1,k}}$ be a bijective from $B_{1,n}^{\boxplus}$ to $[0, 1]$ such that $\lambda(\eta_{B_{1,n}}^{-1}(S)) = \lambda(S)\lambda(B_{1,n}^{\boxplus})$ for every measurable set $S \subseteq [0, 1]$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $g_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ be a function defined as

$$g_n(x) = (\deg_{B_{2,i}}^{W^{\varphi}} \eta_{B_{1,n}}^{-1}(x))_{i \in [n]}$$




Figure 18: The first four projection constraints.




Figure 19: The last two projection constraints.




Figure 20: Infinite constraints.

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and the function $g_\infty : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^\infty$ defined as

$$g_\infty(x) = (\deg_{B_{2,i}}^{W^\varphi} \eta_D^{-1}(x))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

Later in this section (in Subsections 5.11 and 5.12), we show that these functions form a recipe $\mathfrak{G}$, i.e., every $g_n \in \mathfrak{G}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, satisfies (1) for every $k \in [n]$. Note that we will only prove that $\mathfrak{G}$ is a recipe, not a bijective recipe. The fact that $\mathfrak{G}$ is a recipe will imply that ψ_{B_1} and ψ_D defined as follows are measure preserving maps assuming that $\lambda(\psi_{B_1}(B_{1,n})) = \lambda(B_{1,n})$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\psi_{B_1}(x)$ on $B_{1,n}$ as

$$\eta_{B_1}^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} + \frac{r_n^{-1}((\deg_{B_{2,i}}^{W^\varphi} x)_{i \in [n]})}{2^n} \right).$$

Observe that $\psi_{B_1}(B_{1,n}) \subseteq B_{1,n}^\boxplus$ for every n . For $x \in B_1$ that does not belong to any $B_{1,n}$, we define $\psi_{B_1}(x)$ to be equal to the same arbitrary vertex of $B_1^\boxplus$. We later prove that the set of such x has measure zero (and therefore $\lambda(\psi_{B_1}^{-1}(B_{1,n}^\boxplus)) = \lambda(B_{1,n}) = 2^{-n}/27$).

Similarly, for $D^\boxplus$, we define

$$\psi_D(x) = \eta_D^{-1}(r_\infty^{-1}((\deg_{B_{2,i}}^{W^\varphi} x)_{i \in \mathbb{N}})).$$

Let ψ be a map from $[0, 1]$ to $[0, 1]$ consisting of maps ψ_X for $X = A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5, C, D, E_1, E_2, F$. Note that if ψ_{B_1} and ψ_D are measure preserving maps, ψ is a measure preserving map, too.

In the rest of the section, we show that $\mathcal{C}_\boxplus$ force the graphon W to be weakly isomorphic to $W_\boxplus$. Clearly, if the constraints $\mathcal{C}_\boxplus$ force that W has a certain property, W^φ has the same property. Therefore, we speak directly about properties W^φ in our arguments.

We will be proving that $W_\boxplus$ and W^φ are equal almost everywhere for different subgraphons. To do this, we do not need to assume that $\mathfrak{G}$ is a recipe. That is needed for showing that ψ is a measure preserving map, i.e., that $W_\boxplus = W^\varphi$ almost everywhere implies that $W_\boxplus$ and W^φ are weakly isomorphic.

5.1 Forcing $[0, 1] \times C$ —triangular constraints

The first constraint in Figure 7 forces that almost every vertex $c \in C$ has the same relative degree as in C in the parts $A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5$ of the graphon. The second constraint yields that either $N_C(x \setminus y)$ or $N_C(y \setminus x)$ has measure zero for almost every pair $x, y \in X$. This implies that the graphon W^φ has values 0 and 1 almost everywhere on $X \times C$. The choice of ψ implies that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ are equal almost everywhere on $X \times C$ for $X \in \{A_0, \dots, A_3, B_2, \dots, B_5\}$.

We show that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ are equal almost everywhere also on $B_1 \times C$ later in the proof.

The subgraphon on $X \times C$ determines an order on the vertices of X according to their relative degrees in C . We often use this fact when forcing other parts of the graphon. In this context, we will write $x \prec_X y$ instead of $\deg_C x < \deg_C y$ for $x, y \in X$. Abusing the notation, we will also write $Y \prec_X Z$ for $Y, Z \subseteq X$ such that $y \prec_X z$ for every $y \in Y$ and every $z \in Z$.

5.2 Forcing the structure on $A_1 \times A_1$

We now show that the main diagonal checker constraints, which are depicted in Figure 8 force that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ agree almost everywhere on $A_1 \times A_1$. Our line of arguments follows that in [14]. So, we only sketch the arguments.

The first condition in Figure 8 implies that W^φ on $A_1 \times A_1$ is a union of disjoint cliques (and zero almost everywhere else). In particular, W^φ is 0 or 1 almost everywhere on $A_1 \times A_1$. The second constraint determines the edge density on $A_1 \times A_1$. The third constraint implies that the cliques are disjoint intervals with respect to the ordering given by the part C (up to sets of measure zero).

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the set of nonempty intervals corresponding to the cliques forming W on $A_1 \times A_1$. The intervals of $\mathcal{J}$ are linearly ordered by $\prec_{A_1}$. Let m_J denote the measure of an interval $J \in \mathcal{J}$. The fourth constraint forces that for almost every two vertices $a_1 \prec_{A_1} a_2$ in one of the cliques in A_1 ,

$$\lambda(\{a \in A_1 | W^\varphi(a, a_1) = W^\varphi(a, a_2) = 1\})$$

$$= \lambda(\{a \in A_1 | W^\varphi(a, a_1) = 0, W^\varphi(a, a_2) = 0 \text{ and } a_1 \prec_{A_1} a\}).$$

Therefore, $m_I = \sum_{I \prec_{A_1} J} m_J$. According to the second constraint, $\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} m_J^2 = 1/3$.

Thus, the k -th interval of $\mathcal{J}$ has measure 2^{-k} for every k . We conclude that W^φ agrees with $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $A_1 \times A_1$.

5.3 Forcing the structure of other diagonal checker subgraphons

We now use the bipartition constraints, which are depicted in Figure 9 to force the structure of $A_1 \times A_2, A_1 \times B_1, A_1 \times B_2, A_1 \times B_3, A_1 \times B_4, A_1 \times B_5, A_2 \times A_3$ and $A_2 \times B_2$. The constraints are identical for all the pairs except for $A_1 \times B_1$. So we present the argument using $X \times Y$ for any of the above listed pairs except $A_1 \times B_1$. The case $A_1 \times B_1$ is discussed separately afterwards.

The first constraint in Figure 9 forces that W^φ on $X \times Y$ is a union of disjoint complete bipartite subgraphons (and zero almost everywhere else). The second and the third constraints imply that the sides of these complete bipartite subgraphons form intervals in X and Y with respect to the ordering given by C (up to sets of measure zero). The fourth constraint implies that the intervals are in the same order (with respect to C) in both X and Y , i.e., if $I_1 \times J_1$ and $I_2 \times J_2$

are complete bipartite subgraphons, $I_1, I_2 \subseteq X$, $J_1, J_2 \subseteq Y$ and $I_1 \prec_X I_2$, then $J_1 \prec_Y J_2$.

Now, it remains to determine the measures of the sides of the complete bipartite subgraphons.

Recall that we have shown that W^φ agrees with $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $A_1 \times A_1$. We show that the set of constraints depicted in Figure 10 forces that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ agree almost everywhere on $A_1 \times A_2$, $A_1 \times A_3$, $A_1 \times B_1, \dots, A_1 \times B_5$, $A_2 \times A_3$ and $A_2 \times B_2$.

The first constraint in Figure 10 implies that almost all the vertices of A_1 have the same relative degree in A_1 as in Y for $Y \in \{A_2, B_1, \dots, B_5\}$, which determines the measures of the sides of complete bipartite subgraphons of $A_1 \times Y$, yielding that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ agree almost everywhere on $A_1 \times Y$ for every $Y \in \{A_2, B_1, \dots, B_5\}$.

The second constraint in Figure 10 determines the measures of the sides in $A_2 \times A_3$ and $A_2 \times B_2$ in A_3 , B_2 , respectively, yielding that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ agree almost everywhere on $A_2 \times A_3$ and $A_2 \times B_2$.

The third constraint forces that almost every vertex of A_1 has relative degree $1/2$ in A_1 or its relative degree in A_3 is twice as large as in A_1 . Since the sum of measures of all the sides of bipartite subgraphons in A_3 is one, it follows that vertices of A_1 with relative degree $1/2$ in A_1 have relative degree 0 in A_3 .

It remains to analyze the graphon on $A_1 \times B_1$. As before, the first two constraints in Figure 9 for $X = A_1$ and $Y = B_1$ force that W^φ on $A_1 \times B_1$ is a union of disjoint complete bipartite subgraphons and that the sides of the complete bipartite subgraphons in A_1 form intervals with respect to the ordering given by C . The first constraint in Figure 10 for $Y = B_1$ implies that almost all the vertices of A_1 have the same relative degree in B_1 and in A_1 . The choice of ψ_{B_1} implies that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ agree almost everywhere on $A_1 \times B_1$.

5.4 Forcing the structure of $A_0 \times A_1$

We next show that the first level constraints, which are depicted in Figure 11 force W^φ to be equal to $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $A_0 \times A_1$. The first constraint implies that $\deg_{A_0} x = 0$ or $\deg_{A_1} x = 1/2$ for almost every vertex in $x \in A_1$. Since the set of vertices of relative degree $1/2$ in A_1 has measure $1/2$, the edge density on $A_0 \times A_1$ forced by the second constraint implies that $W^\varphi(x, y) = 1$ for almost every $x \in A_0$ and $y \in A_1$ with $\deg_{A_1} y = 1/2$. Therefore, W^φ is equal to $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $A_0 \times A_1$.

5.5 Partitioning W into levels

The structure of W^φ established so far allows us to split the parts $A_1, A_2, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5$ of W^φ into *levels*, in the same way as the parts of $W_\boxplus$ are split. We denote these levels by $A_{i,k}$ and $B_{j,k}$ for the parts A_i and B_j respectively.




Figure 21: Density expressions specifying levels of vertices.

Formally, $A_{i,k}$, $i \in [2]$, is formed by $x \in A_i$ such that $\deg_{A_1} x = 2^{-k}$, $A_{3,k}$ is formed by $x \in A_3$ such that $\deg_{A_2} x = 2^{-k}$ and $B_{j,k}$, $j \in [5]$, is formed by $x \in B_j$ such that $\deg_{A_1} x = 2^{-k}$. Note that this coincides with our previous definition of $B_{1,k}$.

Note that the measure of $A_{i,k}$ and $B_{j,k}$ is 2^{-k} for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in [3]$ and $j \in [5]$. Consequently, almost every vertex of the aforementioned parts belongs to some level. Let us give an example of use of this notation: $A_1 \times A_2$ consists of complete bipartite subgraphons with sides $A_{1,k}$ and $A_{2,k}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_1 \times A_3$ consists of complete bipartite subgraphons with sides $A_{1,k+1}$ and $A_{3,k}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The structure of the graphon W^φ established so far allows to express relations between vertices from different parts of a graphon with respect to their containment in different levels. Some examples are given in Figure 21: the value of the first expression is equal to the probability that a random vertex of B_1 and a random vertex in B_2 belong to the same level. Similarly, the second expression is equal to the probability that a random vertex of B_1 and a random vertex of B_2 belong to the i -th and $(i+1)$ -th level for some i . The third expression is equal to the probability that a random vertex of B_1 is in the first level. Finally, the last expression is equal to the probability that two random vertices of B_1 and B_2 of the same level are connected by an edge.

5.6 Stair constraints

Now, we focus on the stair constraints, which are depicted in Figure 12. They are intended to force the desired structure on $B_1 \times B_3$. The first constraint in Figure 12 determines the relative degrees of vertices of B_1 in B_3 . The second constraint forces for almost every vertex $x \in B_{1,k_0}$ that if x has nonzero relative degree in $B_{3,k}$, it has relative degree 1 in $B_{3,k-1}$, for every k_0 and $k \in [k_0]$.

Consequently, such x has relative degree 1 in every $B_{3,m}$, $m < k$. So, for almost every $x \in B_{1,k_0}$, $W^\varphi(x, y) = 1$ for almost every $y \in B_{3,k}$, $k \leq k_0$ and $W^\varphi(x, y) = 0$ for almost every $y \in B_{3,k}$, $k > k_0$. It follows that W^φ agrees with $W_{\boxplus}^\psi$ almost everywhere on $B_1 \times B_3$.

5.7 Coordinate constraints

The coordinate constraints from Figure 13 force basic structure between the parts B_1 and D on one side and the parts B_2 , B_4 and B_5 on the other side. Here again, the constraints are identical for several pairs or parts, so we present the argument for $B_1 \times X$ in the case of the first constraint depicted in Figure 13 and $Y \times X$ in the case of the second constraint depicted in Figure 13, where $X \in \{B_2, B_4, B_5\}$ and $Y \in \{B_1, D\}$. The first constraint implies that almost every vertex b of B_1 can have nonzero relative degree in X_k only if it has nonzero relative degree in $B_{3,k}$, i.e., only if $b \in B_{1,k_0}$ for $k \leq k_0$. The second constraint implies that $N_Y(b' \setminus b)$ has measure zero for every k and almost every two $b, b' \in X_k$ such that $b \prec_X b'$. This implies that W^φ is equal to 0 or 1 almost everywhere on $Y \times X$.

The definition of ψ on B_1 and D , and the just shown properties yield that $W^\varphi = W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $B_1 \times B_2$ and $D \times B_2$.

5.8 Initial coordinate constraint

The initial coordinate constraint can be found in Figure 15. It forces that

$$\deg_{B_{2,1}} b = \frac{\deg_C b - (1 - 2 \deg_{A_1} b)}{\deg_{A_1} b} \text{ for almost every } b \in B_1.$$

This implies that W^φ agrees with $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $B_1 \times C$. This and the triangular constraints for $B_1 \times C$ yield that every $g_n \in \mathfrak{G}$ satisfies (1) for $k = 1$.

5.9 Distribution constraints

The first constraint in Figure 14 implies that the relative degrees of vertices of B_{2,k_0} in $B_{1,k}$, $k_0 \leq k$, are uniformly distributed. In particular, it holds for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $k_0 \in [k]$ that

$$\deg_{B_{1,k}} b = 1 - \frac{\deg_C b - (1 - 2 \deg_{A_1} b)}{\deg_{A_1} b}$$

for almost every $b \in B_{2,k_0}$. The definition of B_{2,k_0} yields that $\deg_{A_1} b = 2^{-k_0}$ for almost every $b \in B_{2,k_0}$. So, we get that

$$\deg_{B_{1,k}} b = 1 - 2^{k_0} (\deg_C b - (1 - 2^{-(k_0-1)}))$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, every $k_0 \in [k]$ and almost every $b \in B_{2,k_0}$.

This means that relative degree of almost every $b \in B_{2,k_0}$ in $B_{1,k}$ decreases linearly from 1 to 0 with its position within B_{2,k_0} given by $\prec_{B_2}$.

The second constraint in Figure 14 implies that the same is true for degrees of vertices of $B_{2,k}$ in D .

5.10 Product constraints

The product constraints, which are depicted in Figures 16 and 17, imply that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ are equal almost everywhere on $B_1 \times B_4$, $B_1 \times B_5$, $D \times B_4$ and $D \times B_5$.

Recall that the structure of the graphon W^φ established so far implies that W has only values 0 and 1 almost everywhere on $B_1 \times B_4$, $B_1 \times B_5$, $D \times B_4$ and $D \times B_5$ and the neighborhood of almost every vertex of $b \in B_1$ and $d \in D$ in B_4 and B_5 is determined by its relative degree up to a set of measure zero. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that these relative degrees are determined by the product constraints. We present the argument for B_1 , the argument for D is analogous.

The first constraint depicted in Figure 16 implies that $\deg_{B_{4,1}} b = \deg_{B_{2,1}} b$ for almost every vertex $b \in B_1$. The second constraint forces $\deg_{B_{4,i}} b = \deg_{B_{2,i}} b \cdot \deg_{B_{4,i-1}} b$ for almost every $b \in B_1$ and $i > 1$.

Similarly, the constraints depicted in Figure 17 imply that

$$1 - \deg_{B_{5,1}} b = \deg_{B_{2,1}} b \text{ for almost every vertex } b \in B_1, \text{ and}$$

$$\deg_{B_{5,i}} b = (1 - \deg_{B_{2,i}} b) \cdot \deg_{B_{5,i-1}} b \text{ for almost every } b \in B_1 \text{ and } i > 1.$$

This implies that W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ are equal almost everywhere on $B_1 \times B_4$, $B_1 \times B_5$, $D \times B_4$ and $D \times B_5$.

5.11 Projection constraints

We now establish that the projection constraints, which can be found in Figure 18, force that W^φ equals to $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $B_1 \times B_1$. We define $\tilde{g}_n(x)$ to be $g_n(\eta_{B_{1,n}}(x))$ for $x \in B_{1,n}$ to simplify our notation throughout the subsection (recall that $g_n(\eta_{B_{1,n}}(x)) = (\deg_{B_{2,i}} x)_{i \in [n]}$). We start by showing for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that W^φ equals 0 or 1 almost everywhere on $B_{1,k} \times B_{1,k'}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k' > k$ and that

$$\lambda\{b \in B_{1,k} | (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \leq a_i\} = \lambda(B_{1,k}) \prod_{i \in [k]} a_i \quad \text{for every } (a_i)_{i \in [k]} \in [0, 1]^k. \quad (2)$$

Note that (2) implies that

$$\tilde{g}_k(B_{1,k} \setminus Z) \text{ is dense in } [0, 1]^k \text{ for every } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } Z \text{ of measure zero.} \quad (3)$$

Our argument proceeds by induction on k . Recall that the initial coordinate constraints guarantee that (2) holds for $k = 1$.

We now focus on the induction step. The first constraint in Figure 18 forces that the set $N_{B_2}(b \setminus b')$ has measure zero for almost every pair of vertices $b \in B_{1,k}$ and $b' \in B_{1,k'}$, $k < k'$, such that $W^\varphi(b, b') > 0$. This implies for almost every pair

$b \in B_{1,k}$ and $b' \in B_{1,k'}$, $k < k'$, with $W^\varphi(b, b') > 0$, that $\deg_{B_{2,i}} b \leq \deg_{B_{2,i}} b'$ for every $i \in [k]$. In other words,

$$N_{B_{1,k}}(b') \setminus \{b \in B_{1,k} \mid (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \leq (\tilde{g}_{k'}(b'))_i \ \forall i \in [k]\}$$

has measure zero for almost every $b' \in B_{1,k'}$ and

$$N_{B_{1,k'}}(b) \setminus \{b' \in B_{1,k'} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k'}(b'))_i \geq (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \ \forall i \in [k]\}$$

has measure zero for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$.

The second constraint forces that

$$\deg_{B_{1,k}} b' = \deg_{B_{4,k}} b'$$

for almost every $b' \in B_{1,k'}$, $k' > k$. We have shown in Subsection 5.10 that

$$\deg_{B_{4,k}} b' = \prod_{i \in [k]} (\tilde{g}_{k'}(b'))_i \quad (4)$$

for almost every $b' \in B_{1,k'}$, $k' > k$. It follows that if (2) holds for k , then the second constraint implies for every $k' > k$ that W^φ equals to 0 or 1 almost everywhere on $B_{1,k} \times B_{1,k'}$, and that

$$N_{B_{1,k}}(b') \triangle \{b \in B_{1,k} \mid (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \leq (\tilde{g}_{k'}(b'))_i \ \forall i \in [k]\}$$

has measure zero for almost every $b' \in B_{1,k'}$, and that

$$N_{B_{1,k'}}(b) \triangle \{b' \in B_{1,k'} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k'}(b'))_i \geq (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \ \forall i \in [k]\} \quad (5)$$

has measure zero for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$.

To complete the induction step, we should show that (2) holds for $k+1$ assuming it holds for k . The third constraint depicted in Figure 18 guarantees that

$$\deg_{B_{1,k+1}} b = \deg_{B_{5,k}} b = \prod_{i \in [k]} (1 - (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i)$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$. This combined with (2) yields that

$$\lambda(\{b' \in B_{1,k'} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k'}(b'))_i \geq (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \ \forall i \in [k]\}) = \prod_{i \in [k]} (1 - (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i) \quad (6)$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$.

The fourth constraint implies that

$$\deg_{B_{1,k+1}} b = \deg_{B_{1,k+1}^x} b \quad (7)$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$ and $x \in B_{2,k+1}$ where $B_{1,k+1}^x$ is the set of vertices $y \in B_{1,k+1}$ with $W^\varphi(x, y) = 1$ (recall that W^φ is equal to 0 or 1 almost everywhere

on $B_1 \times B_2$ as shown in Subsection 5.7). Note that the structure of the graphon established in Subsection 5.7 yields that $B_{1,k+1}^x$ is the set of vertices $y \in B_{1,k+1}$ of the relative degree at least a_x in $B_{2,k+1}$ for some $a_x \in [0, 1]$ (up to a set of measure zero and for almost every $x \in B_{2,k+1}$). Hence, the equality (7) guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda(\{b' \in B_{1,k+1} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_i \geq (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \ \forall i \in [k]\})}{\lambda(B_{1,k+1})} \\ = & \frac{\lambda(\{b \in B_{1,k+1} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_i \geq (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \ \forall i \in [k] \text{ and } (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_{k+1} \geq a_{k+1}\})}{\lambda(\{b' \in B_{1,k+1} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_i \geq a_{k+1}\})} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$ and every $a_{k+1} \in [0, 1]$. The structure of the graphon established in Subsection 5.9 implies that

$$\lambda(\{b' \in B_{1,k+1} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_i \geq a_{k+1}\}) = (1 - a_{k+1})\lambda(B_{1,k+1})$$

for every $a_{k+1} \in [0, 1]$. This combined with (6) and (8) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\prod_{i \in [k]} (1 - (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i)}{\lambda(B_{1,k+1})} \\ = & \frac{\lambda(\{b \in B_{1,k+1} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_i \geq (\tilde{g}_k(b))_i \ \forall i \in [k] \text{ and } (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_{k+1} \geq a_{k+1}\})}{(1 - a_{k+1})\lambda(B_{1,k+1})} \end{aligned}$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$ and every $a_{k+1} \in [0, 1]$. We conclude using (3) that

$$\lambda(\{b' \in B_{1,k+1} \mid (\tilde{g}_{k+1}(b'))_i \geq a_i \ \forall i \in [k+1]\}) = \prod_{i \in [k+1]} (1 - a_i)$$

for every $(a_i)_{i \in [k+1]} \in [0, 1]^{k+1}$. By the principle of inclusion and exclusion, the equality (2) holds for $k+1$. The completion of the induction step yields that g_n satisfies (1) for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, in particular, ψ_{B_1} is a measure preserving map.

We have shown that $B_{1,k} \times B_{1,k'}$ in W^φ and $W_\boxplus$ agree almost everywhere for $k \neq k'$. It remains to analyze the structure of the graphon W^φ on $B_{1,k} \times B_{1,k}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The first constraint in Figure 19 forces for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $N_{B_2}(b' \setminus b)$ or $N_{B_2}(b \setminus b')$ has measure zero for almost all $b, b' \in B_{1,k}$ with $W^\varphi(b, b') > 0$. Since ψ_{B_1} is a measure preserving map and the graphons W^φ and $W_\boxplus^\psi$ are equal almost everywhere on $B_1 \times B_2$, $B_1 \times B_4$ and $B_1 \times B_5$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(N_{B_{1,k}}(b)) & \leq \lambda(B_{1,k}) \left(\prod_{i=1}^k \deg_{B_{2,i}} b + \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - \deg_{B_{2,i}} b) \right) \\ & = \lambda(B_{1,k}) \left(\deg_{B_{4,k}} b + \deg_{B_{5,k}} b \right) \end{aligned}$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$.

The second constraint in Figure 19 implies that $\deg_{B_{1,k}} b = \deg_{B_{4,k}} b + \deg_{B_{5,k}} b$ for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$. Hence, W^φ has to be equal to 1 almost everywhere on $B_{1,k} \times B_{1,k}$, where it does not have to be zero by the fourth constraint. Therefore, the last two projection constraints imply that W^φ equals to $W_\boxplus$ almost everywhere on $B_{1,k} \times B_{1,k}$ and thus on the whole $B_1 \times B_1$.

5.12 Infinite constraints

In this subsection, we prove that W^φ equals to $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $B_1 \times D$, by proving they are equal almost everywhere on $B_{1,k} \times D$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We also prove that ψ_D is a measure preserving map by showing that g_∞ satisfies (1) for every k . Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed for the rest of the subsection.

Let $d \in D$ and $b \in B_{1,k}$. We define

$$M_{B_1}^k(d) = \{b \in B_{1,k} \mid \forall i \in [k] \deg_{B_{2,i}} b \leq \deg_{B_{2,i}} d\} \text{ and}$$

$$M_D^k(b) = \{d \in D \mid \forall i \in [k] \deg_{B_{2,i}} d \geq \deg_{B_{2,i}} b\}.$$

Note that (2) is equivalent to

$$\lambda(\{b \in B_{1,k} \mid \forall i \in [k] \deg_{B_{2,i}} b \leq a_i\}) = \lambda(B_{1,k}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k a_i$$

for every $(a_i)_{i \in [k]} \in [0, 1]^k$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\lambda(M_{B_1}^k(d)) = \lambda(B_{1,k}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k \deg_{B_{2,i}} d$$

for almost every $d \in D$.

The first constraint in Figure 20 forces that $N_{B_2}(b \setminus d)$ has measure zero for almost every $b \in B_1$, $d \in D$ with $W^\varphi(b, d) > 0$. It follows that $N_{B_{1,k}}(d) \setminus M_{B_1}^k(d)$ and $N_D(b) \setminus M_D^k(b)$ have measure zero for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$ and $d \in D$.

The second constraint in Figure 20 implies that $\deg_{B_{1,k}} d = \deg_{B_{4,k}} d$ for almost every $d \in D$. We have shown in Subsection 5.10 that $\deg_{B_{4,k}} d = \prod_{i=1}^k \deg_{B_{2,i}} d$ for almost every $d \in D$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(N_{B_{1,k}}(d)) &\geq \lambda(B_{1,k}) \cdot \deg_{B_{1,k}} d = \lambda(B_{1,k}) \cdot \deg_{B_{4,k}} d \\ &= \lambda(B_{1,k}) \prod_{i=1}^k \deg_{B_{2,i}} d = \lambda(M_{B_1}^k(d)) \end{aligned}$$

for almost every $d \in D$. Since the measure of $N_{B_{1,k}}(d) \setminus M_{B_1}^k(d)$ is zero for almost every $d \in D$, it follows that $\lambda(N_{B_{1,k}}(d) \triangle M_{B_1}^k(d)) = 0$ for almost every $d \in D$ and $W^\varphi(b, d) = 1$ for almost every $d \in D$ and $b \in N_{B_{1,k}}(d)$.

We have shown that $W^\varphi(b, d) = 1$ for almost any $b \in B_{1,k}$ and $d \in D$ such that $\deg_{B_{2,i}} b \leq \deg_{B_{2,i}} d$ for every $i \in [k]$, and it is zero almost everywhere else in $B_1 \times D$. This implies that W^φ equals to $W_\boxplus^\psi$ almost everywhere on $B_1^\boxplus \times D^\boxplus$. We now show that ψ_D is a measure preserving map. In particular, we need to show that g_∞ satisfies (1) for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

The third constraint in Figure 20 implies that

$$\deg_D b = \deg_{B_{5,k}} b = \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - \deg_{B_{2,i}} b)$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$. Thus,

$$\lambda(M_D^k(b)) = \lambda(N_D(b)) = \lambda(D) \cdot \deg_D b = \lambda(D) \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - \deg_{B_{2,i}} b)$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$. We deduce by the principle of inclusion and exclusion that

$$\frac{\lambda(\{d \in D \mid \forall i \in [k] \deg_{B_{2,i}} d \leq \deg_{B_{2,i}} b\})}{\lambda(D)} = \prod_{i=1}^k \deg_{B_{2,i}} b \quad (9)$$

for almost every $b \in B_{1,k}$.

Finally, observe that the definition of g_∞ yields

$$g_\infty(\eta_D(d)) = (\deg_{B_{2,i}} d)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ for } d \in D.$$

It follows from (3) and (9) that g_∞ is measure preserving.

5.13 Structure involving the parts E_1, E_2 and F

Let $I = [0, 1] \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2 \cup F)$. The degree unifying constraints, which are depicted in Figure 4, imply that for every $X, Y \in \{A_0, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5, C\}$ and almost every $x \in X, y \in Y$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{E_1} W^\varphi(x, z) dz &= (1 - \deg_I x) \text{ and} \\ \int_{E_1} W^\varphi(x, z) W^\varphi(y, z) dz &= (1 - \deg_I x)(1 - \deg_I y). \end{aligned}$$

Following the reasoning given in [26, proof of Lemma 3.3], this implies that

$$\int_{E_1} (W^\varphi(x, z))^2 dz = (1 - \deg_I x)^2$$

for almost every $x \in X$. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields that $W^\varphi(x, z) = 1 - \deg_I x$ for almost every $x \in X$ and $z \in E_1$. This implies that $\deg_{[0,1] \setminus (E_2 \cup F)} x = 1/2$ for almost every $x \in I \setminus D$. Since $W_\boxplus^\psi = W^\varphi$ almost everywhere on I^2 , almost

every $x \in I$ has the same relative degree on I in both $W_{\boxplus}^{\psi}$ and W^{φ} which yields that $W_{\boxplus}^{\psi} = W^{\varphi}$ almost everywhere on $I \times E_1$.

Similarly, the constraints depicted in Figure 5 imply that

$$\deg_{B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_4 \cup B_5 \cup E_2} x = 1/2$$

for almost every $x \in D$ and that $W_{\boxplus}^{\psi} = W^{\varphi}$ almost everywhere on $D \times E_2$.

Finally, the two degree distinguishing constraints in Figure 6 force that W^{φ} on $[0, 1] \times F$ is formed by pseudorandom bipartite graphs $X \times F$ for $X = A_1, \dots, A_3, B_1, \dots, B_5, C$, with densities given by Table 2. Thus, W^{φ} is equal to $W_{\boxplus}^{\psi}$ almost everywhere on $[0, 1] \times F$.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Jan Volec for his comments on the results contained in this paper and very useful suggestions regarding their presentation. They would also like to thank Laszló Lovász for his comments on the relation of the dimension of the space of typical vertices to other aspects of graph limits.

References

- [1] R. Baber: Turán densities of hypercubes, preprint available as arXiv:1201.3587.
- [2] R. Baber and J. Talbot: A solution to the 2/3 conjecture, preprint available as arXiv:1306.6202.
- [3] R. Baber and J. Talbot: Hypergraphs do jump, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **20** (2011), 161–171.
- [4] J. Balogh, P. Hu, B. Lidický, and H. Liu: Upper bounds on the size of 4- and 6-cycle-free subgraphs of the hypercube, *European J. Combin.* **35** (2014), 75–85.
- [5] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan: Sparse graphs: Metrics and random models, *Random Structures Algorithms* **39** (2011), 1–38.
- [6] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, and L. Lovász: Moments of two-variable functions and the uniqueness of graph limits, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **19** (2010), 1597–1619.
- [7] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós, B. Szegedy, and K. Vesztegombi: Graph limits and parameter testing, in: *Proceedings of the 38rd Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*, ACM, New York, 2006, 261–270.

- [8] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós, and K. Vesztergombi: Convergent sequences of dense graphs I: Subgraph frequencies, metric properties and testing, *Adv. Math.* **219** (2008), 1801–1851.
- [9] C. Borgs, J.T. Chayes, L. Lovász, V.T. Sós, and K. Vesztergombi: Convergent sequences of dense graphs II. Multiway cuts and statistical physics, *Ann. of Math.* **176** (2012), 151–219.
- [10] F.R.K. Chung, R.L. Graham, and R.M. Wilson: Quasi-random graphs, *Combinatorica* **9** (1989), 345–362.
- [11] P. Diaconis, S. Holmes, and S. Janson: Threshold graph limits and random threshold graphs, *Internet Math.* **5** (2009), 267–318.
- [12] G. Elek: On limits of finite graphs, *Combinatorica* **27** (2007), 503–507.
- [13] R. Glebov, D. Král’, and J. Volec: A problem of Erdős and Sós on 3-graphs, preprint available as arXiv:1303.7372.
- [14] R. Glebov, D. Král’, and J. Volec: Compactness and finite forcibility of graphons, preprint available as arXiv:1309.6695.
- [15] A. Grzesik: On the maximum number of five-cycles in a triangle-free graph, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **102** (2012), 1061–1066.
- [16] H. Hatami, J. Hladký, D. Král’, S. Norine, and A. Razborov: Non-three-colorable common graphs exist, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **21** (2012), 734–742.
- [17] H. Hatami, J. Hladký, D. Král’, S. Norine, and A. Razborov: On the number of pentagons in triangle-free graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **120** (2013), 722–732.
- [18] C. Hoppen, Y. Kohayakawa, C.G. Moreira, B. Ráth, and R.M. Sampaio: Limits of permutation sequences, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **103** (2013), 93–113.
- [19] C. Hoppen, Y. Kohayakawa, C.G. Moreira, and R.M. Sampaio: Limits of permutation sequences through permutation regularity, available as arXiv:1106.1663.
- [20] C. Hoppen, Y. Kohayakawa, C.G. Moreira, and R.M. Sampaio: Testing permutation properties through subpermutations, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **412** (2011), 3555–3567.
- [21] S. Janson: Poset limits and exchangeable random posets, *Combinatorica* **31** (2011), 529–563.

- [22] D. Král', C.-H. Liu, J.-S. Sereni, P. Whalen, and Z. Yilma: A new bound for the $2/3$ conjecture, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **22** (2013), 384–393.
- [23] D. Král', L. Mach, and J.-S. Sereni: A new lower bound based on Gromov's method of selecting heavily covered points, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **48** (2012), 487–498.
- [24] L. Lovász: **Large networks and graph limits**, AMS, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [25] L. Lovász and V.T. Sós: Generalized quasirandom graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **98** (2008), 146–163.
- [26] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: Finitely forcible graphons, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **101** (2011), 269–301.
- [27] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: Limits of dense graph sequences, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **96** (2006), 933–957.
- [28] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: Regularity partitions and the topology of graphons, in: I. Bárány and J. Solymosi (eds.): *An irregular mind. Szemerédi is 70*, Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies **21**, Springer, 2010, 415–446.
- [29] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: Szemerédi's regularity lemma for the analyst, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **17** (2007), 252–270.
- [30] L. Lovász and B. Szegedy: Testing properties of graphs and functions, *Israel J. Math.* **178** (2010), 113–156.
- [31] S. Norine: private communication.
- [32] O. Pikhurko and A. Razborov: Asymptotic structure of graphs with the minimum number of triangles, preprint available as arXiv:1204.2846.
- [33] O. Pikhurko and E.R. Vaughan: Minimum number of k -cliques in graphs with bounded independence number, preprint available as arXiv:1203.4393.
- [34] A. Razborov: Flag algebras, *J. Symbolic Logic* **72** (2007), 1239–1282.
- [35] A. Razborov: On 3-hypergraphs with forbidden 4-vertex configurations, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **24** (2010), 946–963.
- [36] A. Razborov: On the minimal density of triangles in graphs, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **17** (2008), 603–618.
- [37] V. Rödl: On universality of graphs with uniformly distributed edges, *Discrete Math.* **59** (1986), 125–134.

- [38] A. Thomason: Pseudo-random graphs, in: A. Barlotti, M. Biliotti, A. Cossu, G. Korchmaros, and G. Tallini, (eds.), North-Holland Mathematics Studies **144**, North-Holland, 1987, 307–331.
- [39] A. Thomason: Random graphs, strongly regular graphs and pseudorandom graphs, in: C. Whitehead (ed.), Surveys in Combinatorics 1987, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, **123**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1987, 173–195.
- [40] P. Turán: On an extremal problem in graph theory, *Mat. Fiz. Lapok* **48** (1941), 436–452. [in Hungarian] (Also see: On the theory of graphs, *Colloq. Math.* **3** (1954), 19–30.)